

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

PCT

To:

GILL JENNINGS & EVERY
Broadgate House
7 Eldon Street
London EC2M 7LH
GRANDE BRETAGNE

WRITTEN OPINION (PCT Rule 66)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)		13.11.2003
Applicant's or agent's file reference MJB07059WO		REPLY DUE within 3 month(s) from the above date of mailing
International application No. PCT/GB03/01254	International filing date (day/month/year) 24.03.2003	Priority date (day/month/year) 08.04.2002
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC E21B43/36		
Applicant COOPER CAMERON CORPORATION et al.		

- This written opinion is the **first** drawn up by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
- This opinion contains Indications relating to the following items:
 - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - II ☐ Priority
 - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
 - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
 - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application
- The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also: For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

If no reply is filed, the International preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
- The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 08.08.2004

Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Diaz y Diaz-Caneja,

Formalities officer (incl. extension of time limits)
Kermani, N
Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7740



BEST AVAILABLE COPY

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (*Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed"*):

Description, Pages

1-18 as originally filed

Claims, Numbers

1-23 as originally filed

Drawings, Sheets

1/12-12/12 as originally filed

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages:
- ☐ the claims, Nos.:
- ☐ the drawings, sheets:

5. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).

(Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this opinion.)

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims	1, 2, 4, 5
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1, 2, 4-23
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	

2. Citations and explanations**see separate sheet**

Re Item V

Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- 1) D1 (US-A-5 117 908), discloses a subsea process assembly for (see PCT-Guidelines III, 4.8) separating a multiphase flow, the assembly comprising:
- an inlet 1 for a multiphase medium;
 - a pressure reducing means 8 for (see PCT-Guidelines III, 4.8) reducing the pressure of the multiphase flow from the inlet and creating a source of energy (see column 2, lines 40-43);
 - a multiphase separator 11 for (see PCT-Guidelines III, 4.8) separating the multiphase input into individual phases (see column 2, lines 49-53); and
 - a pumping system for (see PCT-Guidelines III, 4.8), in use, pumping at least one of the desired individual phases to a delivery point by utilising of the energy from the source of energy (see column 2, lines 55-56).

The subject-matter of claim 1 is known.

Thus, the subject-matter of claim 1 does not meet the novelty requirement of Art. 33(2) PCT.

- 2) D1, also discloses the additional features of the following claims:
- 2, 5 (see item 18)
 - 4 (see figs. 4 and 5)

Thus, the subject-matter of claims 2 and 4-5 does not meet the novelty requirement of Art. 33(2) PCT.

- 3) The additional features of dependant claim 3 are not disclosed in any of the documents cited in the search report. If the applicant is of the opinion that the subject-matter of independant claim 1 comprising any of these features would meet the requirements of Art. 33(1) PCT, he should claim 3 with claim 1, bearing in mind that the features known in combination in D1 should be placed in the preamble of claim 1 in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT.

- 4) Claim 20, even though is formulated as independant, specifies all the features of

claim 1 and therefore, "de facto", is also dependant from claim 1.

- 5) The additional features of claims 6-23 are either known from the documents mentioned in the search report or comes within the scope of the knowledge of a skilled person.

Thus, these claims do not appear to contain any additional features which in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, could form subject-matter which is new and involves an inventive step (Art. 33(2)-(3) PCT).